



AF ZW

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to:



Mail Stop Brief
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On: July 26, 2005
By: Richard D. Fuerle

Signature: 
Date of Signature: July 26, 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Applicant: Qi Wang

Examiner: Egwin, Kelechi Chidi

Serial No.: 09/761,625

Group Art Unit: 1713

Filed: January 17, 2001

For: STABILIZATION OF POLYMERS AFTER EXPOSURE TO OXIDATION

The Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANT

Sir:

This is a second Brief in reply to new points raised in the Examiner's second Answer, dated July 18, 2005.

Appellant is on record (i.e., his Reply Brief filed May 10, 2004) that his claims are to be interpreted according to the definition in The Condensed Chemical Dictionary, Tenth Edition, that "aryl" requires "either the six-carbon ring of benzene or the condensed six-carbon rings of the other aromatic derivatives." The ring must be six-

membered. Appellant is permitted to be his own lexicographer and Appellant has chosen to define "aryl" according to that definition, which is an accepted definition in the chemical arts. That definition does not include the 5, 7, and 18-membered ring compounds cited by the Examiner.


When Appellant claims "aryl from C6 to C20" it means a group that contains a 6-membered ring. That accounts for 6 of the carbon atoms. The remaining 14 carbon atoms can be in other groups that are not necessarily "alkyl" and therefore are not covered by the terms "alkaryl" or "aralkyl." This is acceptable claim language and has been used in hundreds, if not thousands, of issued chemical patents.

As to the Examiner's arguments concerning triple bonds, the compounds in question are used by Appellant as stabilizers. An unstable "stabilizer" is not a "stabilizer" in Appellant's invention as such a compound could not stabilize the polymer. The word "stabilizer" implies that the compound must exist at least for a significant amount of time, and unstable compounds do not.

For these reasons and the reasons given in Appellants' Brief and first Reply Brief, it is submitted that Appellant's specification meets the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. The Board is therefore requested to reverse the Examiner and allow Claims 25 to 27, 31 to 34, 36, 38, 39, 42, and 44 to 46.

Three copies of this Brief are submitted.

Respectfully submitted,



RICHARD D. FUERLE
Registration No. 24,640
For Appellant



OCCIDENTAL CHEMICAL CORPORATION
5005 LBJ Freeway
Dallas, Texas 75244-6119
(716)-774-0091
CASE 6956cont
July 26, 2005